

**INTER-COMPARISON OF GOES-8 IMAGER AND SOUNDER SKIN  
TEMPERATURE RETRIEVALS**

**by**

**STEPHANIE L. HAINES**

**A THESIS**

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Science in  
The Department of Atmospheric Science  
of  
The School of Graduate Studies  
of  
The University of Alabama in Huntsville**

**HUNTSVILLE, ALABAMA**

**2001**

## THESIS APPROVAL FORM

Submitted by Stephanie L. Haines in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Atmospheric Science.

Accepted on behalf of the Faculty of the School of Graduate Studies by the thesis committee:

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date) Committee Chair

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Department Chair

\_\_\_\_\_ College Dean

\_\_\_\_\_ Graduate Dean

## ABSTRACT

The School of Graduate Studies  
The University of Alabama in Huntsville

Degree Master of Science College/Dept. Science/Atmospheric Science

Name of Candidate Stephanie L. Haines

Title Inter-Comparison of GOES-8 Imager and Sounder Skin Temperature Retrievals

Skin temperature (ST) retrievals are derived from Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite (GOES) data. Retrievals from the GOES-8 Imager and Sounder instruments are inter-compared in order to study the effects of the spatial resolution and calibration differences. Single-pixel resolution retrievals from both instruments were found to contain significant striping errors. The 3x3-pixel averaged Imager product had relatively small striping errors and maintained more small-scale natural variations than the Sounder 3x3 product. Averaging (3x3) reduced the standard deviation of ST across a domain by approximately 0.5 K. Correlation coefficients between Imager and Sounder products were found to be greater than 0.99. Comparisons of GOES retrievals to ground truth radiometric data were difficult to interpret because of differences in footprint size and viewing angle, but did reveal correlation coefficients greater than 0.98. Comparisons of GOES-11 data to GOES-8 data revealed an average improvement factor of 1.4 in the GOES-11 striping errors for both instruments.

Abstract Approval: Committee Chair \_\_\_\_\_

Department Chair \_\_\_\_\_

Graduate Dean \_\_\_\_\_

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

I would like to thank in particular my advisor, Dr. Gary Jedlovec, and Mr. Ron Suggs for their support, guidance and patience. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee, Dr. Sundar Christopher and Dr. Qingyuan Han, for their advice and suggestions. Thank you to Dr. Jamie Daniels of NOAA/NESDIS for supplying the GOES-11 data and the GOES-8 NESDIS skin temperature products. Ground skin temperature data were obtained from the Atmospheric Radiation Measurement (ARM) Program sponsored by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Biological and Environmental Research, Environmental Sciences Division. This work was partially supported under the GOES Improved Measurements and Products Assessment Plan (GIMPAP).

Finally, gratitude to my husband John for his endless love and support without which this achievement would not have been possible.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Figures .....	vii
List of Tables .....	x
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. BACKGROUND.....	5
2.1 The GOES Satellites .....	5
2.1.1 The GOES Satellite Sensors.....	6
2.1.2 The GOES Imager and Sounder Spectral Bands.....	9
2.1.3 Calibration of the GOES Sensors.....	12
2.2 Physical Split Window Retrieval Technique .....	17
2.3 Cloud Masking Technique.....	21
III. DATASETS & METHODOLOGY .....	24
3.1 GHCC GOES-8 Imager and Sounder Data.....	25
3.2 GOES-11 Data .....	26
3.3 GHCC GOES Retrievals.....	26
3.4 Calculation of Striping Errors within GOES Images.....	29
3.5 Ground Truth Data.....	31
3.6 Buoy Sea Surface Temperature Measurements .....	33
IV. RESULTS.....	35
4.1 GOES-8 Imager and Sounder Inter-Comparisons .....	36
4.1.1 GOES-8 Imager and Sounder Image Comparisons.....	37

4.1.2	GOES-8 Imager and Sounder Mean Temperature Comparisons .....	45
4.1.3	GOES-8 Imager and Sounder Standard Deviation Comparisons .....	61
4.1.4	GOES-8 Imager and Sounder ST Tendency Comparisons ....	68
4.2	Comparison of GOES-8 Imager and Sounder ST Retrievals to Ground Truth.....	72
4.2.1	Comparisons to the ARM Site.....	72
4.2.2	Comparisons to Buoy Data.....	81
4.3	Comparisons Between GOES-8 and GOES-11 .....	85
4.3.1	Striping Comparison Results.....	85
4.3.2	GOES-8 and GOES-11 ST Retrieval Comparisons .....	91
4.4	Comparison of a GOES-8 Imager Scene to a MODIS Scene.....	109
V.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	113
	REFERENCES.....	116

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
2.1 GOES-East Imager routine scanning sectors (Satellite Services Division (SSD)/NOAA 2001). .....	8
2.2 GOES-East Sounder routine scanning sectors (SSD/NOAA 2001) .....	8
2.3 GOES-8 spectral response curves and atmospheric transmittance in the infrared window region for the Sounder (top panel) and the Imager (bottom panel) .....	11
2.4 Comparisons of GOES-8 and GOES-11 noise levels to specifications (Daniels and Schmit 2001) .....	15
2.5 Sounder (top left) and Imager (top right) cloud masks, and the Imager visible (bottom left) and infrared (bottom right) images at 13:45 UTC on April 25, 2001 .....	23
3.1 Map of the study domains, showing the CONUS domain (red), SE domain (blue) and the ocean domain (green) .....	25
3.2 Locations of the ARM SPG site and the ten selected buoys .....	32
3.3 ARM Southern Great Plains central facility site (available online at <a href="http://www.arm.gov/general/photolibrary/photos.html">http://www.arm.gov/general/photolibrary/photos.html</a> ) .....	32
4.1 Skin temperature retrievals from the GOES-8 Sounder (left panels) and Imager (right panels) at single pixel resolution (top panels), 3x3 pixel averaged retrievals (middle panels), and 5x5 pixel averaged retrievals (bottom panels) at 1145 UTC on 15 July 2000 (a), 1445 UTC on 19 September 2000 (b), 1745 UTC on 22 January 2001 (c), 2045 UTC on 25 April 2001 (d), and 2345 UTC on 29 September 2000 (e) .....	38
4.2 Mean skin temperature values computed from single pixel resolution retrievals over the CONUS domain .....	47
4.3 Average differences between Sounder and Imager mean temperatures (Sounder – Imager) computed over the CONUS domain for the four case study periods .....	49
4.4 Scatter plots of mean Sounder and Imager temperatures computed over the CONUS domain using method 1(a) and method 2(b). .....	51

4.5	Mean skin temperature values computed from single pixel resolution retrievals over the SE domain .....	54
4.6	Differences between GHCC Sounder and Imager (a,e), NESDIS Sounder and Imager (b), NESDIS and GHCC Imager (c), and NESDIS and GHCC Sounder (d), mean temperatures computed over the SE domain .....	56
4.7	Mean skin temperature values computed from single pixel resolution retrievals over the ocean domain .....	59
4.8	Differences between Sounder and Imager mean temperatures computed over the ocean domain for the two cases presented in Figure 4.7 .....	60
4.9	Standard deviation values computed from single pixel resolution retrievals over the CONUS domain .....	63
4.10	Comparisons of standard deviation values computed from single pixel and averaged retrievals over the CONUS domain.....	66
4.11	Skin temperature tendencies computed from single pixel resolution retrievals over the CONUS domain .....	69
4.12	Single pixel Imager and Sounder ST point retrievals compared to ARM data .....	74
4.13	Scatter plots of GOES Sounder (top panels) and Imager (bottom panels) single pixel (left panels) and 3x3 averaged (right panels) ST retrievals versus ARM ST values .....	77
4.14	Hourly ST tendencies of single pixel Imager and Sounder retrievals at the ARM site .....	79
4.15	SSTs from GOES-8 Imager and Sounder single pixel resolution retrievals, brightness temperatures from the Imager and Sounder split window channels, and water and air temperatures from buoy 42019 on September 30, 2000 (a) and from buoy 42039 on January 24, 2001 (b) .....	82
4.16	Comparison of GOES-8 (left panels) and GOES-11 (right panels) Imager striping from July 27, 2000 at 2145 UTC .....	86
4.17	Comparison of GOES-8 (left panels) and GOES-11 (right panels) Sounder striping from July 26, 2000 at 1445 UTC .....	87



4.18	GOES-8 and GOES-11 ST retrievals at single pixel resolution and 3x3 pixel averaged resolution at 1130 (Imager) and 1145 (Sounder) UTC on July 25, 2000 (a), 1330 and 1345 UTC on July 26, 2000 (b), 1530 and 1545 UTC July 26, 2000(c), 2130 and 2145 UTC July 26, 2000 (d), 2330 and 2345 UTC July 26, 2000 (e) .....	93
4.19	Skin temperature retrievals at the ARM site at single pixel resolution (a) and 3x3 pixel averaged resolution (b) from GOES-8 and GOES-11 .....	99
4.20	GOES-8 and GOES-11 mean skin temperature values computed from single pixel resolution retrievals over the CONUS region on July 25, 2000 .....	102
4.21	GOES-8 and GOES-11 mean skin temperature values from 3x3 pixel averaged retrievals over the ocean domain on July 27, 2000.....	104
4.22	GOES-8 and GOES-11 standard deviation values computed from single pixel resolution retrievals (a), and 3x3 pixel averaged retrievals (b) over the CONUS region on July 25, 2000.....	106
4.23	MODIS LST image from 5 March 2001 at 1650 UTC.....	111
4.22	GOES-8 Imager ST image from 5 March 2001 at 1645 UTC .....	112

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1 GOES-8 Imager characteristics.....	7
2.2 GOES-8 Sounder characteristics.....	7
4.1 GOES-8 and GOES-11 Imager average striping errors.....	89
4.2 GOES-8 and GOES-11 Sounder average striping errors.....	89